



THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE, CHATTANOOGA, MARTIN, TULLAHOMA, MEMPHIS

**FACULTY COUNCIL
MEETING 30 - MINUTES**

Wednesday, August 15 2012, 3:00 p.m. CST (videoconference).

UT Faculty Council Members

UTHSC	George Cook (Campus Representative)-present Thad Wilson (Faculty Senate President)-present
UTK	Steve Thomas (Faculty Senate President)-present David Patterson (Campus Representative) (UTFC Secretary)-absent
UTM	Robert Nanney (Faculty Senate President)-present Jenna Wright (Campus Representative)-present
UTC	Janet Wilbert (Board of Trustees Faculty member-Voting) (UTFC Chair)-present Deborah McAllister (Faculty Senate President)-arrived 3:40 p.m. Ralph Covino (Campus Representative)-present
Guest	Vicki Steinberg (Board of Trustees Faculty member-nonVoting)-present Gavin Townsend - UTC

Call to Order by Chair Wilbert at 3:05 p.m.

Roll Call

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the June 19-20, 2012 minutes. Corrections: George Cook is Campus Representative and Thad Wilson is Faculty Senate President; Deborah McAllister was not present at the Wednesday UTFC meeting. Minutes approved as amended.

New Business

1. Academic Freedom in shared governance (prep for Sept. 13 meeting). Wilbert explained that documents sent previously are for the membership to review prior to the September 13th meeting in Nashville. We do not have confirmation that Lela will be able to attend, but this will be a topic of discussion if she makes the trip. **(post meeting confirmation, Lela cannot attend)**
2. P & T external letters. Discussion determined that some departments/units do and some do not require external letters for P & T. There also seems to be not current consistency regarding the number of letters required or the credentials of the letter writer. Thomas offer to forward to the group recent language adopted at UTK (see below for recent UTK wording. Entire document is Part IV of the UTK Faculty Handbook http://provost.utk.edu/facultyhandbook/pdfs/2010-faculty_handbook.pdf)
 - a. UTHSC has new language being proposed that includes guidelines outlining the qualifications of those who can submit letters and the total number of letters required.
 - b. UTC has pending changes
 - c. UTM leaves this to the department/unit
3. Second handbook retreat – Wilbert will check with Katie High regarding any plans for an additional retreat. Discussing concluded that all campus revisions that were handed down

from Legal should probably be completed before another retreat occurs.

- a. Discussion of faculty handbooks that are two parts where the evaluations part of the handbook has been removed from the official handbook. Legal has informed the campuses that the evaluation manual will have to be vetted by the BOT also.
4. Name tags – Wilbert reported that name tags will be distributed at the September meeting in Nashville.
5. Discussion from the UTC campus regarding the attempt to quantify the work that faculty do and that evaluations of faculty should include “work” beyond the traditional description and should include work on campus QEP’s internships, etc.

Old Business

1. Update on faculty handbook tracking system
 - a. The electronic tracking and recommendation/approval workflow built in SharePoint. The Knoxville system is ready to go but the Chancellor has some concerns that we are addressing, so there is a (hopefully temporary) hold on implementation right now. We can start building for other campuses any time if it’s ok with your leadership.
2. Update on when date from ModernThink and Sibson surveys will be made available to the faculty
 - a. Sibson - The person to contact on each campus is the HR officer. Wright offered to check the CAB website for information and has forwarded the link to the CAB. Although the website exists, there is very little information on the site regarding the actual report. Only selected slides have been imbedded in the text as links.
http://humanresources.tennessee.edu/cab/market_assessment.html
 - b. The employee engagement reports with various breakdowns of the data have been provided to the Chancellors to distribute as they determine. The raw data is owned by ModernThink and will not be made available to UT. For the Knoxville campus, the main faculty information was collected last year in a separate process (using the same instrument) – I do not know how that was distributed or reported. Faculty will need to check with their Chancellors or Provosts for this information.
3. Update on training for department heads
 - a. The department chair training materials/plans are in development and should be piloted at UTHSC this fall. They are focusing on Conflict Resolution, Annual Review Process and P & T process. There was discussion that this training was going to be mandatory and not a program that all department heads should be required to attend.
4. UTFC.tennessee.edu is the UTFC website location; check the website for your information (accuracy).
5. Financial transparency – UTC, UTK, UTM campuses have adequate access to budgetary documents upon request. UTHSC has made many attempts to obtain budget information and have not been successful. Cook indicated that another attempt will be made.

Other Business

1. Reminder that official campus reports are requested for the three meetings of UTFC when in conjunction with the BOT meetings. Otherwise, campus kudos can be reported at videoconference meetings at-will.
2. Next meeting September 13, 2012 in Nashville. There has been a request for Jamie Perry (IT) and Lela (Legal) to attend to discuss the IT reorganization and the issues with academic freedom language.

Move to adjourn at 3:55 p.m.

4. The process for obtaining external letters of assessment

The department head or designate (e.g., chair of a departmental tenure and promotion committee) is responsible for the process of obtaining letters from external evaluators. The head, or designate, should initiate the process of obtaining external letters of assessment far enough in advance of the review process that letters are in the dossier and available to peer review committees and administrators at all levels of review. Candidates for tenure and promotion should not contact prospective or actual external evaluators under any circumstances.

a. **Qualifications of External Evaluators.** External evaluators should be distinguished individuals in the candidate's field who are in a position to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's research record and to comment on its significance in the discipline. Whenever possible, letters should be solicited from individuals at peer institutions or aspirational peer institutions, in particular, from faculty employed at AAU institutions. If individuals at non-peer institutions are solicited for letters, the department head must explain the reasons for the choice of these individuals (including without limitation evidence of the reviewer's exemplary experience and standing in the candidate's field). Evaluators will normally hold the rank of professor and must have attained at least the rank to which the candidate aspires. Evaluators must be able to furnish an objective evaluation of the candidate's work and may not be former advisors, post-doctoral supervisors, or close personal friends of the candidate or others whose relationship with the candidate could reduce objectivity. If the evaluator has had a collaborative scholarly or research relationship with the candidate, the nature of that collaboration and the relative contributions of the candidate must be clearly described by the evaluator. A reviewer's appearance on an academic panel or roundtable with the candidate or attendance at a symposium or conference with a candidate, taken alone, does not constitute a relationship with the candidate that could reduce objectivity. Questions concerning the eligibility of potential evaluators should be referred to the office of the Dean and, where appropriate (e.g., where the department is a college or where the Dean is uncertain about how to resolve the matter), Provost well in advance of making a request from the individuals in question. Each evaluator will be asked to state expressly in his or her review letter the nature of any association with the candidate.

b. Method for Obtaining External Assessments.

- The department head or designate, in consultation with departmental faculty, assembles a list of potential external evaluators.
- The department head or designate requests the names of potential evaluators from the candidate.
- The department head or designate also requests names of individuals the candidate wants excluded and the reasons for the exclusions.
- The department head or designate will normally solicit 8-10 letters. No more than half of the letters solicited should come from the list suggested by the candidate.
- The dossier will normally include no fewer than five letters from external evaluators.
- All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier unless the Office of Academic Affairs approves their removal from the review process.
- The dossier will include a log documenting all requests for letters from external evaluators. The log documents the date on which each external letter was requested by

the department head or designate and the date on which the letter was received. All requests should be entered regardless of whether a response was obtained. The log will also indicate which evaluators come from the candidate's list and which are from the list of the department head or designate.

- The department head or designate will send to the external evaluators information and documentation for use in preparing the external assessment including the candidate's *curriculum vitae*, appropriate supporting materials concerning the candidate's research or creative activity, and the departmental and collegiate statements of criteria for promotion and/or tenure.